

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application, claims 1-19 of which are rejected.

The dependency of claim 15 has been amended to depend on claim 11 rather than claim 1 as required by the Examiner.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 7, 13, 14 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections of 35 U.S.C. Section 112 and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten claim 1 to reflect a combination of original claims 1, 6 and 7; has rewritten claim 11 to reflect a combination of original claims 1 and 13; and, has rewritten claim 16 to reflect a combination of original claims 16, 17 and 18.

Finally, claims 1, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, along with their dependent claims, based upon the use of the language "a major portion" along with the statement that it is "It is impossible to distinguish the instant invention from the prior art". Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections on the basis that the meaning of 'major portion' is readily apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art from the Specification and Drawings.

Specifically, the meaning is submitted to be clear from the contrast between Figures 3 and 7 where, in the prior art Figure 3, distribution is shown as an uneven distribution of inlet airflow, whereas Figure 7 illustrates an improved airflow pattern where the axis extending sidewall portions cause air to be drawn into the blower inlet openings 57 and 61 in a substantially uniform distributed manner as indicated by flow stream lines 80 and 81. The airflow is substantially uniform about at least a major portion of the circumference of the inlet openings (see paragraph number 27 of the Specification). It is clear from reading the Specification and contrasting Figures 3 and 7 that "a major portion" means "substantially all".

Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 be reconsidered based on the foregoing comments. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, applicant proposes the language "substantially all" be considered as a substitute for the phrase "at least a major portion" so that, for example, the last two lines of claim 1 read: "which extend to said inlet opening over substantially all of said inlet opening".

With the foregoing comments explaining the meaning of the phrase "a major portion" and proposing an alternative terminology should the Examiner not accept applicant's explanation, applicant believes that the claims on file in the application are allowable as indicated by the Examiner's comments and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,


William O'Driscoll
Registration No. 33,294

Telephone Number: (608) 787-2538